

Applicants submitted a letter to the PTO on October 29, 2002 informing the Patent Office that copies of all references cited on the PTO 1449 form were attached and submitted. Applicants respectfully request an initialed PTO-1449 indicating that the Examiner has considered all the references.

Rejections under 35 USC 103(a)

The Examiner rejects claims 1-19 as obvious over Furuta USP 6,306,501 (Furuta '501) in view of Harvey USP 5,589,236 (Harvey '236). Applicants traverse the rejection and respectfully request the withdrawal thereof.

The present invention is directed to a laminate made up of a first layer comprising a liquid crystalline polymer having optical anisotropy in a molten state and adhered to the first layer by an adhesive is a second layer containing a saponified ethylene-vinylester copolymer. The present invention has excellent gas barrier properties even under high humidity.

Furuta '501 discloses a laminated material with a continuous liquid crystal polyester resin and a rubber on a paper substrate. Furuta '501 fails to disclose a saponified ethylene-vinylester copolymer. Harvey '236 also fails to disclose a saponified ethylene-vinylester copolymer.

Since, the combination of references fails to disclose each and every limitation of the claimed invention, Applicants submit

that the Examiner has failed to establish a prima facie case of obviousness. Thus, the rejection should be withdrawn.

The Examiner also rejects claims 1-6 and 8-19 as obvious over Sumida USP 5,364,669 (Sumida '669) in view of Furuta USP 5,997,765 (Furuta '765). Applicants traverse the rejection and respectfully request the withdrawal thereof.

Sumida '669 discloses a laminated material having a liquid crystal polymer layer and a thermoplastic layer. However, Sumida '669 does not disclose a saponified ethylene-vinylester copolymer. The secondary reference, Furuta '765 also does not disclose a saponified ethylene-vinylester copolymer.

As such, Applicants submit that the Examiner has failed to establish a prima facie case of obviousness as all the limitations of the present invention are neither disclosed nor suggested by the combination of references. Thus, the rejection should be withdrawn.

Conclusion

As Applicants have addressed and overcome all rejections in the Office Action, Applicants respectfully request that the rejections be withdrawn and that the claims be allowed.

Pursuant to 37 C.F.R. §§ 1.17 and 1.136(a), Applicants respectfully petition for a three (3) months extension of time for

filing a reply in connection with the present application, and the required fee of \$930.00 is attached hereto.


Should there be any outstanding matters that need to be resolved in the present application, the Examiner is respectfully requested to contact Kecia Reynolds (Reg. No. 47,021) at the telephone number of the undersigned below.


If necessary, the Commissioner is hereby authorized in this, concurrent, and future replies, to charge payment or credit any overpayment to Deposit Account No. 02-2448 for any additional fees required under 37 C.F.R. §§ 1.16 or 1.17; particularly, extension of time fees.

Respectfully submitted,

BIRCH, STEWART, KOLASCH & BIRCH, LLP

By

 #32868
S Raymond C. Stewart, #21,066


RCS/KJR:bmp
2185-0560P

P.O. Box 747
Falls Church, VA 22040-0747
(703) 205-8000